DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 294 839 SP 030 159

AUTHOR Zion, Richard
TITLE Factors to Consider in Planning Effective Staff Development Programs. Occasional Paper No. 17.
INSTITUTION National Staff Development Council, Oxford, OH.
PUB DATE Jan 87
NOTE 29p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; Change Agents; *Delivery Systems; Governance; *Participant Satisfaction; Participative Decision Making; *Program Effectiveness; *Staff Development; *Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Role

ABSTRACT

This paper identifies a number of factors that staff developers should consider in planning an effective program. A staff development program is considered to be effective if teachers adapt the material or content learned into their classrooms and retain the implementation over time, if teachers and administrators express satisfaction with the program, and if student achievement in basic skills is increased. The following dimensions to consider in planning a professional development program are discussed: (1) program purpose; (2) organizational content; (3) program delivery; (4) scheduling of activities; and (5) program policy and management decisions. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED294839

FACTORS TO CONSIDER IN PLANNING EFFECTIVE STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

by

Richard Zion

* Occasional Paper Series

National Staff Development Council

OCCASIONAL PAPER NO. 17

January, 1987

SP030159

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

S. Havens

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

One of the most debated and researched topics in education during the last decade has been the issue of staff development (Betz, Jensen, & Zigarmi, 1980). A 1983 Phi Delta Kappa newsletter identified over 9000 articles listed in Education Resources Information Clearinghouse (ERIC) which were related to this topic (Betz, Jensen, & Zigarmi, 1980). The causes of the renewed interest in staff development center on the recent trends of student population decline, decreased teacher mobility, reduction in force clauses, the growth of a stable tenured staff, and a decade of reform (1965-75), which led researchers to the conclusion that the best practices are likely to fall in the hands of a poorly trained staff (Edwards, 1981). Many school districts throughout the country have not been able to rely upon a steady supply of new teachers to bring new ideas and changes to their schools. These school districts have been confronted with the problem of trying to stimulate an aging, secure staff through inservice activities.

Despite the problem, renewed interest in staff development and the commitment of money and time, these efforts to create change have not always been successful. One reason for this has been the lack of teacher input in the planning of the activity. Many inservice programs are simply a conglomeration of activities, often determined by availability or strong advertising. As a result, teachers often have a negative view of inservice programs. Betz, Jensen, and Zigarmi (1978), found that 65.4 percent of the staff viewed the inservice as irrelevant to their teaching needs, 68.6% indicated that the program was not well planned, and over half believed that the inservice had not improved their teaching.

A second factor related to the failure of many inservice programs is that the activities often consist of a series of unrelated half-day "shots" which usually fail to involve the teacher in identifying staff needs. The emphasis is on teacher training rather than teacher education. A third factor leading to the failure of many staff development programs is that the activities often focus on the professional development of the teacher and ignore school-wide instructional improvement. Gall (1985) found that only one-fifth of the inservice activities were related to school improvement and that these inservice programs were likely to concentrate on the development of individual knowledge. Finally, present staff development activities often fail because staff planners tend to ignore features of adult learning theories which stress participant involvement in planning and decision making, the importance of feedback, and the need to practice what is being learned.

Although some of the research on staff development is speculative, contradictory, and at times based entirely upon attitudinal surveys, there are a number of studies which have attempted to identify those dimensions of a staff development program that are related to improving school and teacher effectiveness. Many of these studies have developed from the research on both effective schools as well as school improvement. One of the earliest and most thorough studies on effective staff development procedures was the Rand study (McLaughlin & Marsh, 1978), often referred to as the Change Agent Study. The first phase of this study involved a survey of 293 local projects in 24 school districts. Phase 2 involved a survey of 100 projects in 20 states and 18 school districts. This study

collected a tremendous amount of information about the process of change at the local level. The Rand study and studies by Fullan (1982), Gall and Renchler (1983), Schalock and Fielding (1985) have attempted to isolate those factors which often lead to successful staff development programs.

It is the purpose of this paper to identify a number of factors that staff developers should consider in planning an effective program. For the purpose of this paper, a staff development program is considered to be effective if teachers adapt the material or content learned into their classrooms and retain the implementation over time, teachers and administrators express satisfaction with the program, and student achievement in basic skills is increased. Such criteria includes not only participant satisfaction but also the measures of whether the content and material of the inservice is used in the classroom and has a positive effect on student achievement.

Program Purpose

The first dimension that needs to be considered in planning a professional development program is purpose. Traditionally, there are a number of purposes for staff development, including personal development, credentialing, specific skill training (such as gifted, special ed., etc.) curriculum implementation, school improvement, and increased student achievement. As stated earlier, most staff development activities are concerned with the personal or professional development of the staff and few deal with improving basic skill development of students. Arends' 1983 study of inservice activities for first year teachers as well as Fielding

and Schalock's study (1985) of inservice activities revealed a heavy emphasis upon individual teacher professional development. Although this emphasis upon individual professional development is not entirely inappropriate, the lack of concentration upon overall school improvement and student achievement limit the effectiveness of many inservice programs.

A second problem associated with the purpose of many inservice programs is the over-emphasis upon affective activities. Teachers tend to give priority to the affective domain as opposed to student skill development. Sullivan's (1981) study of teachers' priorities for staff development indicated that there were twice as many statements about affective than cognitive needs of students. Sullivan estimated that only ten percent of the programs dealt with math or reading instruction. Schurr's (1980) research concluded that teachers prefer topics on student motivation and attitudes. (Thus, when given the chance, teachers will generally opt for affective activities rather than basic skills.)

Although the emphasis upon individual personal development and the affective domain are not entirely inappropriate activities, the lack of concentration upon overall school improvement and student achievement limit the effectiveness of many inservice programs. If staff development programs are to be effective, they must focus on school improvement. The Rand study revealed that effective inservice activities must be a part of a school improvement process which includes "on-going" problem solving. Staff development purposes may grow out of documented deficiencies within the school or reflect the need to take advantage of new developments or

build upon existing strengths. Whatever the situation, staff development programs should reflect the goals and priorities of the district and should have as an ultimate goal, increased student achievement.

Once a general purpose has been identified, an effective staff development program must communicate that purpose to the participants. A perennial problem in many inservice activities is a lack of clarity in what is expected. Hall and Loucks (1980) concluded that one way to ensure the failure of a staff development activity was to have unclear expectations. Ogletree and Allen (1974) and Gross (1971) concluded that teachers believed the purpose of inservice activities were not clearly defined and that many teachers were unable to identify the essential features of the change that they were supposed to adapt to their classrooms.

Obviously, if programs are to be effective, the purpose and objectives must be made clear. Fullan and Pomfret (1977) found that the extent to which an activity will be implemented is directly affected by the ability of the planner to express programs in operational terms. Precise goals, however, may lead to what Fullan calls a "dilemma of explicitness." According to Fullan (1982), "To make innovations highly explicit at the development stage may mean that they are inappropriate for the variety of settings faced by teachers" (p. 10). The dilemma occurs when the innovator's purpose is too general. Confusion arises as teachers attempt to implement the change. The resolution to the problem, according to Fullan, is to follow Berman's 1980 study and recognize that some staff development programs such as specific skill development may require

specificity in purpose while those that are more complex and on-going may require more general guidelines during the initial stage. Regardless of this dilemma, staff planners need to realize that the participants must be aware of expected behaviors.

Organizational Context

A second dimension to be considered in planning an effective staff development program is the organizational context in which it will take place. Lieberman and Miller's (1984) research on staff development emphasized the need to understand the social systems of schools if the content and materials of an activity were to be implemented.

The Rand (1978) and Little (1984) studies both indicated that the degree of implementation is often influenced by the social context of a school. The social context or culture of the school are the shared beliefs, values, and ideals of the school community, as well as the views of the roles of teachers and students. This social context can affect the effectiveness of inservice activities. Unfortunately, much of the research indicates that staff development activities often ignore the cultural norms and values that do exist in a school. Wolcott (1977), cited a typical example where a staff development activity emphasizing long range planning failed because the participants were mainly concerned with the quality of day to day classroom activities.

In analyzing the social organizations of schools for those characteristics that might be most conducive to effective staff development, researchers (Moore and Hyde, 1981, Little, 1984) have

commented upon the prevalence of "loose coupling." Loose coupling refers to the lack of integration in the various components of schooling. In many school districts, classroom teachers, principals, specialists, and district office personnel, often act as autonomous professionals and may view their job as a solo enterprise as opposed to a collective one. Moore and Hyde's (1981) research of large school districts revealed that staff development responsibilities are often spread out to a variety of people who are usually reacting to different factors. This tendency may result in a situation where those planning a staff development activity may not be communicating with those who are actually responsible for implementing the practice. Thus, the inservice activity may not be the result of a deliberate collaboration process and therefore not reflect the district's agenda for school improvement.

If a staff development program is to be effective, attention needs to be paid to decreasing the isolation of the staff and creating a more tightly coupled environment. In such an environment, there is an integration of the functions of schooling, and a knowledge and commitment to district goals for school improvement. In the initial stages of the staff development program, planners can assist this coupling characteristic and thereby improve the chances of implementation of the inservice activity by reducing the fear of risk-taking, providing moral support and tolerance of errors, and by realizing that educational change requires extensive preparation and group interaction. Little's (1984) study on effective staff development programs concluded that the implementation of a staff development activity will be significantly

enhanced where teachers share ideas and concerns in an atmosphere of collegiality.

A strong sense of efficacy is a teacher characteristic which will facilitate a collegial atmosphere as well as improve the chances of implementing an effective change. Teacher efficacy is often defined as a belief of a teacher that even the most difficult of students can be helped. The Rand study (1978) described teacher efficacy as a very powerful teacher characteristic related to successful obtainment of staff development goals. Clark, Lotto, and Astuto (1984) also concluded that teacher efficacy is the one teacher characteristic that is consistently associated with effective change. Teacher efficacy can be encouraged by staff development planners by viewing the inservice activity as developmental as opposed to the traditional deficit model where teachers are viewed as lacking something. In this traditional model, various authority figures - administrators, certification officials, state and federal government officials -- identify what skills or knowledge that teachers are lacking and design an activity to "remediate" these deficiencies. If, on the other hand, staff development is a part of a program that places heavy emphasis upon staff support activities which involve the staff in decision making and provides a sense of ownership, the chance of a successful implementation will be greatly improved. In summary, if staff development programmers treat teachers as professionals teacher efficacy may be improved. If the teacher's sense of efficacy is improved, effective staff development will be enhanced.

Program Delivery

A third dimension to be considered in planning an effective staff development program is how that program is to be delivered. The delivery of an inservice activity can be influenced by a number of factors including the need for readiness activities, the nature of the participants, the instructional process to be used, the degree of monitoring needed, and the scheduling. Although the preceding factors are not an exhaustive list, the research indicates that planners need to be aware of their effect on a successful implementation.

Readiness activities, or the inservice activities needed prior to the skill training, do have an important effect on how well the inservice program will be accepted and eventually implemented. Loucks and Pratt (1979) and Pankratz and Martray (1981) both emphasize the importance of developing an awareness among the participants, especially among the formal and informal leaders. Staff developers could enhance the effectiveness of the program by holding meetings that deal with teachers' concerns about the inservice and attempt to build a consensus to participate. At this stage in the program development process, there is a need to create a feeling of ownership. Simultaneously, the leadership of the school also needs to understand the purpose of the activity and support the effort.

The number extent of readiness activities needed depends upon the complexity of the program -- the number of different activities, skills, or understandings that participants are expected to develop or refine. Staff development planners need to determine whether some participants

already posses some of the skills and to what degree the skill needs to be adapted to the classroom.

If the program to be adopted is unfamiliar, staff developers need to introduce the program gradually. Gerston, Carmine, and Williams (1982) concluded that complex topics need to be introduced slowly over a long period of time. If complex skills are introduced quickly, chances are that teacher frustrations can result and destroy any chance that the activity will be implemented into the classroom.

Although planners will need to have some extensive readiness programs for the more complex and less familiar activities, Fullan's (1982) research indicates that the more complex the project, the more likely the chances of obtaining a high proportion of commitment from the participants. Such projects tend to appeal to the professionalism of a staff member and will generate more interest in the initial stage than an activity which may be viewed as the "same old thing".

After determining what readiness activities are required, staff development organizers need to analyze the nature of the participants. There are a number of participant characteristics that may affect staff development programs. The autonomy of the classroom teacher and the prevalence of loose coupling have been previously described and planners need to remember that the predominance of strong classroom autonomy may hinder district-wide change.

A second participant related factor to be considered is the participants' and the districts' previous history with inservice programs. The more teachers have had negative experiences with previous efforts the

more cynical they will be about the next change. A third participant trait to be considered is the age and experience of the participants. Although more research needs to be done on the relationship between age and types of staff developmental programs, it is apparent that the needs of inexperienced teachers may vary from those of the more experienced staff. The inexperienced teacher tends to be concerned with topics dealing with student behavior and class management and are trying to adapt to the school organization. Experienced teachers, on the other hand, may want to explore new areas of interest and may view many attempts to provide inservice on present practices as a waste of time (McLaughlin and Marsh, 1978). The Rand study (1978) also indicated that staff development for experienced teachers (over 40 years of age and with 20 or more years of experience) needs to be personalized and directed to areas of interest.

A second concern in the delivery of inservice programs is what instructional processes are most effective in promoting teacher acceptance, assuring implementation, and increasing student achievement. Almost without exception, the research as discussed below on staff development indicates that teachers prefer working and learning from one another, and they desire programs that are relevant to the day to day activity of the classroom. Lawrence's study (1980) revealed that teachers tended to view inservice more positively when they were provided mutual assistance than when they were working alone. Holly's (1982) survey of 110 teachers indicated that teachers prefer working with other teachers and that teachers viewed their colleagues as sources of information and "understandable allies". Ngaryaye-Hanley's (1978) study of 225 teachers

reflected a strong teacher bias for activities that brought together teachers of similar interest. In regard to the relevancy issue, Holly (1982) concluded that "personal relevance" was the single most important factor in determining the worthiness of a staff development program. Furthermore, Dillon-Peterson (1986) stated that a teacher's ability to apply a staff development program was greatest when it is applied and practiced in the context of real problems. The greater the practicality of the inservice, the more likely it will be implemented.

Besides guaranteeing teacher participation and relevancy of the topic to classroom situations, effective staff development programs are characterized by a number of other instructional processes. In conducting the initial inservice activity, it is important that the instructor identify and clarify the goals of the session, take responsibility for the design of the program, and use direct instruction. Such programs are more effective than those that encourage participants to assume these roles. The research also appears to indicate that programs developed by outside groups such as government officials, university people, or professional consultants tends to be more effective than those developed by local staff (Wade, 1985). This conclusion tends to contradict earlier studies that indicated that programs initiated by staff are more effective. What appears to be important is not so much the need for teacher initiation but the need for teacher involvement and the ability to modify the inservice to local needs.

Successful inservice models as Hunter's Instructional Theory Into Practice and Stallings Effective Use of Time Program, avoid the "one-shot"

approach and incorporate into the activity extensive observations of classroom practice, video and audiotaping, microteaching, and continual feedback over a period of time. Other effective instructional techniques include the opportunity for participants to practice the new ideas in the classroom, to view demonstrations by expert practitioners, and to have the training at the school site. Staff development programs that give participants ample readings and manuals that describe the activities so that participants can discuss these with the trainer also tend to be effective. On the other hand, inservice sessions that rely on lecture as the major means of teaching, or that make extensive use of simulations and field trips, tend to be less effective.

Along with the need for effective instructional practices, a common theme running through the research on effective staff development is the need to monitor the program so that the desired change is adapted into the classroom and maintained over time. Since no planner or instructor can fully anticipate the problems that might arise as teachers adapt the activity to their individual classroom, the inservice must be of sufficient duration to provide feedback to teachers when the need arises. The Rand study (1978), as well as most other recent studies, (Gall & Renchler, 1985; Fielding & Schalock, 1985), concluded that the one day institute had far less effect on teacher behavior than a continuous workshop that included monitoring. The Rand study (1978), also implied that many inservice programs fail because they are not matched with the reality of the classroom. An inservice activity should therefore provide opportunities for teachers to adapt the new behavior to their classroom in

their own way, the Rand study (1978) referred to this as "mutual adaptation" and identified this process as being strongly correlated to an effective program.

Fullan's study (1982), also identified the need for sustained interaction of the participants as a key to successful inservice regardless of its purpose. The four model programs cited by Gall (1985) were all maintained over several months of training and often contained refresher manuals and frequent feedback sessions. Both Stallings (1981) and Showers (1985) revealed that without extensive monitoring, the transfer of new skills to the classroom will not occur. Stalling's model for staff development includes sessions on presenting information, effective demonstration, follow-up discussion, application, and coaching. It appears that for staff development activities to be effective, they must include components to monitor the gain made in the initial training.

One common characteristic inherent in the monitoring and maintaining of a program is the use of coaching. Fielding and Schalock (1985) described coaching as "psychological support and technical assistance for teachers who were integrating knowledge and skill acquired through inservice training into their day to day teaching practices" (p. 19). Viewed in this manner, coaching brings assistance directly into the classroom in a collegial fashion. The purpose is to provide the teacher with feedback as to when to apply a model and how it can be adapted to meet the needs of specific students.

The worthiness of coaching is not universally accepted, and staff developers need to be aware of the advantages and disadvantages of such a

technique. Brandt (1984) states that it is a final monitoring tool which increases the chances that new learning will be adapted. Stallings' program is based upon the use of facilitators or coaches and seems to indicate that classroom teachers can be effectively trained to perform this function. Showers (1985), in her study of the effects of coaching, insisted that the use of coaching has a strong relationship to the long-term effect of the inservice. According to Showers, after 6 months of training, coached teachers as compared with non-coached teachers made better use of instructional models; were better able to integrate new models into daily instruction; used more activities more skillfully; and used activities as appropriate times. The Rand study (1978), indicated that coaching was a possible way to provide a supporting structure so that skills learned in the inservice would continue to be used.

A different view is presented by Wade (1985), who insisted that coaching as an instructional technique does not alter teaching behavior to the extent identified by Showers. According to Wade, coaching is not always effective. She cited the study by Sparks (1983) which concluded that inservice consisting of workshops plus coaching were no more effective than workshops alone or workshops with peer observation. Wade (1985) also identified four reasons why coaching might fail. These factors include the lack of time in most inservice programs for the coach and trainer to develop a relationship of mutual respect; the lack of tolerance given to people to improve and the eagerness of supervisors to pry information from the trainer; the inability of coaches to foster independence and avoid quick solutions and that the benefits are often

blocked by rivalry and fears of the trainer.

In trying to resolve this dispute over the effectiveness of coaching, staff developers need to make sure that certain procedures are followed to assure that coaching will provide the desired effect of maintaining the skills learned in the initial stages. First, for coaching to be effective, sufficient time must be allowed for the coach and trainer to establish a relationship based upon mutual trust and understanding. Second, the coach must clearly understand that the role is one of facilitation not supervision. Good coaches do not solve the problems for the teachers but assist them in the process. It is important for the coach to keep the emphasis upon the skill to be monitored and not the technical aspects of coaching. If these conditions are met, coaching can be a valuable asset to a staff development activity by providing necessary reinforcement at a critical time when the teacher is trying to adapt the new skills to the classroom.

A final dimension to be considered in the delivery of the inservice is the scheduling of activities. Several references have already been made to the necessity of avoiding the 1-day institutes. This is especially true if the purpose of the inservice is to implement an innovation that is significantly different from the present practice. Loucks-Pratt (1979) estimated that from 3-5 years may be needed to introduce, explain, and maintain an innovation. Although such length may not be needed for all activities, the inservice must be in short meaningful segments spread over time. In this fashion the participants can digest the new content and react to changing situations.

In addition, a majority of participant time should be spend in small groups of six to eight people to encourage the sharing of ideas and to overcome any reservations that participants might have. Little (1984) and Wade (1985) also indicate the need to include people of high status and to incorporate elementary and secondary personnel in the same sessions. Wade's 1985 meta analysis technique revealed that inservice programs which contained both high school and elementary participants were more effective than those that included just elementary or just secondary teachers.

A final consideration for staff developers is to schedule the inservice program at a time so as to not interfere with other teacher obligations. Even though Betz (1978) found a strong preference for day-time activities during the school year, Lawrence-Harrison (1980) concluded that effective programs tended to be scheduled during evening and summer so as to not interfere with other duties. The same study revealed that similar programs offered during the school year were less productive. In actual practice, over half the inservice takes place after or before school, and one-fourth on weekends. If proper incentives are available, and if the other factors described in this paper have been followed, it is likely that effectiveness of the inservice can be positively affected by scheduling such activities outside the instructional day.

Governance

Governance involves the policy and management decisions affecting the inservice program. The research discussed below on effective staff

development indicates that key governance issues are teacher involvement, recruitment procedures, technical considerations, evaluation, and the role of the building principal in the inservice process.

The need for teacher involvement has been emphasized throughout this paper. This is also true when considering the role of staff in the initial planning stages. Several studies (Rand, 1978, Fullan, 1982, Little, 1984) indicate that planning from the top will not succeed and that teacher involvement in the initial stages of planning is a necessary requirement. According to the Rand study (1978), top down planning fails because it does not generate staff commitment and ownership and often fails to incorporate the expert knowledge and suggestions of teachers. Top down planning also tends to result in spotty implementation and resistance from the staff.

Although a degree of staff involvement is important in the planning stages, the research also indicates that staff planners need not rely upon the staff to initiate the staff development program. Fullan (1982) concluded that a high degree of staff participation in the early stages of planning may be negatively correlated to successful implementation. Like many groups, teachers are often threatened by change and may first find the change as unneeded and not worth their effort. Little (1984) states that teachers left to their own preference may avoid a new practice rather than take the chance that a significant investment of time will not be worth their effort. Furthermore, Crandall (1983) concluded that teacher commitment to a change may develop only after it is adapted and the classroom benfits are known.

Staff developers should not only involve teachers in planning but should select "high status" teachers who will command the attention and respect of other staff members. Planners should then attempt to develop a core of instructors who clearly understand the purpose of the inservice and are committed to its success. Effective staff development programs do not always develop from the grass-roots and at times need to be initiated from the top (Gehrke & Parker, 1981).

A second governance issue is whether participation in the inservice program should be mandatory or voluntary. There is a limited amount of research on whether mandatory participation has any effect on program effectiveness. Gall and Renchler (1985), and Fielding and Schalock (1985) concluded that whether an activity should be mandatory depended on its purpose. Programs designed for individual professional growth and those that are new and untested could be offered on a voluntary basis. Inservice programs, however, that have school-wide significance and a strong research base should be mandatory. Schalock and Fielding (1985) point out that programs can be mandatory without participants feeling that they are being coerced. If staff developers have provided for staff involvement in the planning phase and have clarified the purpose of the activity, participants may desire to participate even though attendance may be mandatory.

A third governance issue for staff developers is the various technical resources needed to conduct the activity. Without proper procedures and resources an activity can be doomed from the start. The resources needed could include released time, curriculum guides, proper texts and support

materials, testing programs, and adequate budgets to cover the costs of these materials. Proper procedures could include proper student placement, evaluation instruments, and sufficiently lengthy time lines. Failure to provide technical assistance could add to the burden of trying to bring about a successful implementation.

A key governance issue confronting staff developers is the role of the building principal. The research discussed below is quite clear on the importance of the principal's role in promoting an effective inservice activity. Without the principal's active support, implementation and long term change is unlikely. According to the Rand study (1978), those activities viewed negatively by the principal had fewer goals achieved, resulted in less teacher change, and were rarely continued after the initial instruction. In Fielding and Schalock's (1985) study on effective staff development programs, groups which included the principal as a participant had greater student achievement gains than groups without principals. The group which involved principals also retained behavior longer. Loucks and Pratt (1979) identified the principal as critical to the success of any implementation effort. Little (1984) found that effective principals were likely to be an active participant in staff development programs.

If an inservice is to be effective, staff planners need to assure that the building principal presents a strong message to the staff about the legitimacy of the project and the need for the staff to take responsibility for their own professional growth. This support, however, cannot be restricted to vocal support. Sparks (1983) concluded that for

programs to be implemented, the principal needs to participate, show enthusiasm, and provide the needed technology for the success of the program. The need for principal participation in the actual inservice was cited in several studies as being crucial to long-term implementation. Wade (1985) concluded that the quality of implementation depended upon the principal's participation and understanding of the desired change. Fielding and Schalock (1985) found that the principal's participation set clear expectations for the staff to be involved, established a collaborative and collegial atmosphere, and guarded against premature evaluation of the program. If the principal actively supports the inservice and at least participates in the initial stages so as to understand the skills and knowledge inherent in the change, staff development effectiveness can be enhanced.

A final governance factor to be considered by staff developers is the evaluation process. As previously mentioned, many staff development programs rely upon some sort of participant attitudinal survey to judge the success of the activity. Since many inservice programs consist of 1-day presentations focusing on personal development, the use of an attitudinal instrument is understandable. If the inservice is designed as outlined in this paper, however, the evaluation process must reflect more than a positive or negative response from the participants. Since effective inservice programs are continuous and on-going, the evaluation must also be continuous.

Griffin (1982) in his staff development program, Interactive Research and Development in Teaching, argued that inservice evaluation should be

formative as opposed to summative. Formative evaluation is characterized by periodic analysis of the programs in order to assure that necessary modifications and changes can be continually made.

Griffin (1982) identified several characteristics of a formative evaluation program. He believes that evaluation should be based primarily upon qualitative data so as to increase the planner's ability to explain the summary data and make any needed modifications in the inservice. Griffin, as well as Gall (1985) and Fielding and Schalock (1985), agree that the evaluation procedures should be explicit and public. Due to the often strong negative connotations that often surround evaluation processes, staff developers should take strides to assure that the evaluation procedure will reflect the purpose of the staff development program and an evaluation of the program, (and the participants).

Evaluation should also be considerate of the participant's time and energy. Techniques that require lengthy questionnaires, surveys, and extensive interviews should be avoided. Both Griffin (1982) and Powell (1980) argued that evaluation techniques should be informal and be designed so that the feedback can be readily received. Techniques such as audio-taping, daily logs, and diaries are effective in providing feedback without making excessive demands upon the participant's time. Furthermore, the principal can be of assistance by keeping the inservice focused and provide needed feedback through faculty newsletters, meetings, and bulletins. Such procedures provide planners with needed feedback and permit an exchange of ideas during the period of the inservice.

A final characteristic is that the evaluation should focus on all

levels of the organization. Not only should the evaluation assess the program's impact on the primary group, the participants, but also consider its effects on all aspects of the organization. It is not uncommon for a program to be successful in changing participants' behavior, but have the implementation of the change thwarted by others in the organization. Unless all levels of the organization are part of the evaluation process, it may be difficult to identify why the program was not implemented. Evaluation procedures, like the staff development program itself, must be conscious of the school context, which includes people, their belief systems, the history of the district, the levels of power as well as the notions of how one improves within the system. If the evaluation design does not reflect this context, it may not generate the data needed to make credible judgements.

Conclusion

Schools can no longer rely upon a high teacher turn-over to facilitate change. Staff development has become a top priority in schools. Despite large expenditures, many inservice programs fail to meet the needs of the participants, do not lead to permanent changes, and have no effect upon student achievement.

This paper has attempted to identify several factors which staff developers should examine to assure the effectiveness of an inservice program. Although more research needs to be done on such issues as mandatory versus voluntary recruitment, the value of coaching, and the receptiveness of experienced teachers to inservice training, the existing

research does identify several characteristics of effective programs. Staff planners need to design inservice activities which foster a spirit of collegiality, are continuous, are focused upon schools or district-wide goals, and provide for active participation of administrators as well as teachers. Staff developers should keep in mind that staff development is a process not an event.

Bibliography

Arends, R. (1980). Beginning teachers as learners. Journal of Educational Research, 76, 235-242.

Berman, P. (1980). Toward an implementation paradigm. In Lehming and Kane (eds.), Improving Schools. Sage.

Betz, L., Jensen, D. and Zigarmi, P. (1978). South Dakota teachers view in-service education. PHI DELTA KAPPAN, 59, 491-493.

Clark, D., Otto, L., and Astuto, T. (1984). Effective schools and school improvement: A comparative analysis of two lines of inquiry. Educational Administrative Quarterly, 20, 41-68.

Crandall, D. (1983). The teacher's role in school improvement. Educational Leadership, 41 (3), 6-9.

Edwards, S. (1981). Changing teacher practice: A synthesis of relevant research. Austin, Texas; University of Texas.

Emrick, J. A., and Petersen, S. M. (1978). A synthesis of findings across five recent studies in educational dissemination and change. San Francisco: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development.

Fielding, G. and Schalock, H. (1985). Promoting the professional development of teachers and administrators. Eugene, Oregon: Center for Educational Policy and Management.

Fullan, M. (1982). Implementing educational change: Progress at last. Paper prepared for the National Institute of Education conference on the implications of research on teaching for practice, Ontario.

Fullan, M. and Panfret, M. (1977). Research on curriculum and instruction implementation. Review of Educational Research, 47, 335-397.

Gall, M. and Renchler, R. (1985). Effective staff development for teachers - A research based model. Eugene, Oregon: Center for Clearinghouse on Educational Management.

Gehrke, N. J. and Parker, W. (1981). A longitudinal study of the process of planning and implementing an instructional improvement in-service program. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Los Angeles.

Gersten, R., Carmine, D. and Williams, P. (1982). Measuring implementation of a structured educational model in an urban school district: An observational approach. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 4, 67-79.

Griffin, G. (1979). Guidelines for the evaluation of staff development programs. In Ann Lieberman and Lynne Miller's Staff development - New demands, new realities, new prospectives. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University.

Gross, N., Giacquinta, J., and Bernstein, M. (1971). Implementing organizational innovations: A sociological analysis of planned educational change. New York: Basic Books.

Hall, G. and Loucks, S. (1980). Program definition and adaptation: Implications for inservice. Austin, Texas: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, University of Texas.

Holly, M. (1982). Teachers views on in-service training. PHI DELTA KAPPAN, 63, 417-418.

Lawrence, G. and Harrison, D. (1980). Policy implications of the research on the professional development of educational personnel: An analysis of fifty-nine studies. Washington, D.C.:, Feistritzer Publications.

Little, J. (1982). Norms of collegiality and experimentation: Workplace conditions of school success. American Educational Research Journal, 19 (3), 325-340.

Loucks, S. and Pratt, H. (1979). A concerns based approach to curriculum change. Educational Leadership, 37, 212-15.

Mann, D. (1985). Impact II and the problem of staff development. Educational Leadership, 42, 44-45.

McLaughlin, M. and Marsh, D. (1978). Staff development and school change. Teachers college record, 80, 70-94.

Moore, D. R. and Hyde, A. A. (1981). Making sense of staff development:

An analysis of staff development programs and their costs in three urban districts. Chicago: Chicago Designs for Change.

Naumann-Entienne, M. and Todd, J. (1976). Applying organizational development techniques. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

Ngaiyaye, M., and Hanley, J. (1978). What teachers want from in-service education. North Central Association Quarterly, 53, 305-311.

Ogletree, E. and Allen, B. (1974). Urban teachers evaluate in-service meetings. Champaign Urbana: University of Illinois.

Pankratz, R. and Martray, C. (1981). A collaboration involvement strategy for educational improvement. Paper presented at the annual convention of the association of teacher education, Dallas.

Peterson, B. (1986). Trusting teachers to know what's good for them. In Zumwalt, Karen (ed.), Improving teaching - ASCD yearbook, Alexandria, Virginia: ASCD.

Powell, G. (1980). Developing an effective in-service program. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Plains regional conference of the International Reading Association.

Rosenholtz, S. (1985). Effective schools: Interpreting the Evidence. American Journal of Education, 352-387.

Schurr, K. T. Discrepancies in teacher and administrator preference for in-service training topics. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston.

Showers, B. (1985). Teachers coaching teachers. Educational Leadership, 42 (5), 44-49.

Sother, D. (1983). Practical applications of research. Phi Delta Kappa Newsletter, 5.

Sparks, G. (1983). Synthesis of research on staff development for effective teaching. Educational Leadership, 40, 65-72.

Sparks, G. and Sparks, D. (1984). Fffective teaching for higher achievement. Alexandria, Virginia: ASCD.

Stallings, J. A. and Mohlman, G. G. (1981). School policy, leadership style, teacher change, and student behavior in eight schools, final report. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education.

Sullivan, R. (1981). City's teacher training program criticized in 1977-78 state audit. New York Times, 26, 4-5.

Wade, R. (1985). What makes a difference in in-service teacher education? A meta-analysis of research. Educational Leadership, 42, 48-54.

Wolcott, H. (1977). Teachers v. technocrats. Eugene, Oregon: University of Oregon Center for Educational Policy and Management.

Wood, F., Freeland, R., and Szabo, J. (1985). School improvement is more than school improvement. Educational Leadership, 42, 63-66.

Zumwalt, K. (ed.) (1986). Improving teaching ASCD yearbook. Alexandria, Virginia: ASCD.